

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 27, 2004. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Specification Objection

The specification has been objected to for containing various informalities. Specifically, the Office Action identifies that the specification refers to reference numbers 102 and 106 respectively as computer and scanner, which is incorrect in view of Figure 1.

In response to the objection, Applicants have amended the specification to correct reference numbers provided on page 4. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above-described amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification is not objectionable, and therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Casey, et al. ("Casey," U.S. Pat. No. 6,452,695). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the Casey reference. Applicants discuss Applicants' remaining claims and the Casey disclosure in the following.

Independent claim 1 provides as follows (emphasis added):

1. A system for improving the performance of a plurality of peripheral devices, comprising:
 - a first peripheral device including a first software component and having a first functionality; and
 - a second peripheral device including a second software component and having a second functionality, the second peripheral device being coupled to the first peripheral device *without an intermediate computing device positioned along the communication path between the peripheral devices*, the first and second peripheral devices together performing a third functionality in addition to the first and second functionalities and having a common user interface.

As is identified in the foregoing, Applicants amended independent claim 1, from which each of claims 3 and 5-11 depend. In view of those amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 5-11 is moot as having been drawn against those claims in their original form. Applicants therefore request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the merits of the claims, Applicants note that Casey at least does not teach or suggest first and second peripheral devices that are coupled to each other "without an intermediate computing device positioned along the communication path between the peripheral devices". To the contrary, in every embodiment, Casey teaches a dedicated "adapter device 100" that is positioned between peripheral devices

and that acts as an intermediary for those devices. *See, e.g., Casey* Figure 1. Casey therefore fails to anticipate claims 1, 3, and 5-11 for at least this reason.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey in view of the Wireless Networks document. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As is identified above in reference to independent claim 1, Casey fails to teach explicit limitations of Applicants' claims. In that the Wireless Networks document does not remedy the deficiencies of the Casey reference, Applicants respectfully submit that remaining claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable over Casey. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

IV. Canceled Claims

As is identified above, claims 2 and 12-23 have been canceled from the application through this Response without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.


V. New Claims

As identified above, claims 24-42 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully request that these claims be held to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on

12-21-04

Mary Morgan
Signature